EVOLUTION AND CULTURE

MUNTSCH

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

23-17914
.60¢

Evolution and Culture:

Their Relation in the Light of Modern Ethnology

BY
REV. ALBERT MUNTSCH, S.J.

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

B. HERDER BOOK CO.
17 SOUTH BROADWAY, ST. LOUIS, MO
AND
68 GREAT RUSSELL ST., LONDON, W. C.
1923

IMPRIMI POTEST

M. Germing, S. J.,
Vice-Praep. Provincialis

NIHIL OBSTAT

Sti. Ludovici, die 3. Oct., 1923
F. G. Holweck,
Censor Librorum

IMPRIMATUR

Sti. Ludovici, die 3. Oct., 1923
✠ *Joannes J. Glennon,*
Archiepiscopus
Sti. Ludovici

Copyright, 1923
by
B. Herder Book Co.

All rights reserved

Printed in U. S. A.

FOREWORD

It is the object of this work to set forth arguments against the evolutionary theory of the spread of culture. To the objection that there is no reference to *a priori* or metaphysical proof for his position, the writer's answer is that the present line of development was purposely chosen. It was thought best to quote the leading authorities opposing out and out evolutionary hypotheses. It cannot be denied that in some of the text-books on sociology the work of these authorities is ignored. The students are left under the impression that the guesses and "high-piling hypotheses" of Spencer, Morgan, and J. G. Frazer have never been successfully attacked.

Again, from his experience in the classroom the writer was led to believe that students want "facts," and not what they have been taught to despise as "metaphysical arguments." Here is a collection of facts and data which

show the weakness of the evolutionary theory of culture. It is but fair that the writers of texts in sociology should take cognizance of them.

CONTENTS

	Introduction	1
I.	Evolutionary Theories of Culture Rejected by Anthropologists	7
II.	Evolutionary Theories of Culture Opposed by Facts	14
III.	Treatment of Children and Position of Women among Primitives	27
IV.	Private Property Among Primitives	40
V.	The Theory of a Real "Matriarchy" is Unfounded	53
VI.	Some Belated Text-Book Opinions	62
VII.	Frazer's "Golden Bough" Once More	67
VIII.	Two American Sociologists on the "Primitive Family"	73
IX.	Anthropologic Science Avoids Far-reaching Hypotheses	80
X.	From Evolutionism to Historic Interpretation	84
XI.	Ethnology Supplies the Basis for Studies in the Development of Culture	90

INTRODUCTION

Text-books of sociology generally contain chapters on "Social Control," "The Evolution of Ethics," "Social Standards," "The Development of Social Institutions," "The Origin and Forms of the Family," etc. It is evident that knowledge concerning the beginnings of these various manifestations of human culture cannot be sought from history, psychology, biology, politics or economics. Recourse must be had to a special science—Ethnology. This is the science of the races of men and of their character, history, customs, and institutions. It deals more especially with the so-called lower races, that is, with those that have not yet fully acquired what is commonly spoken of as "Western civilization."

Now ethnology, like other more recent sciences, has uncertain boundaries. It is related to, and borrows from, Archæology, Anthropology, History and other "social sciences," that are concerned with the study of man in his various activities.

Partly on account of the very uncertainty of its proper scope, and partly on account of the interest attaching to the early history of man,[1] the science has attracted numerous workers and students. Missionaries, travelers, explorers, colonial officers, and military men on the lonely outposts of civilization, have all contributed to our knowledge of the lore and custom and practices of "other races."

One danger in the steady growth of the science, resulting from these many and various contributions, was not guarded against. This was the tendency to find ready explanations for similar customs among widely separated races by a principle that has been so extensively applied in biology,—that is, by evolution. It was naïvely taken for granted that all that was needed to account for the growth of cultural institutions like the family, monogamous marriage, private property, etc., was to establish "stages" of these universal social institutions and to link them together by a rigid "line of development" from the crudest form in "primi-

[1] Witness the keen interest shown in the recent exploration of the tomb of Tutankhamen in Egypt.

tive society" to their highest expression in modern civilization.

A scholar who has gathered a stupendous amount of material illustrating primitive folklore, magic, religion, etc., is Sir J. G. Frazer. The thirteen volumes of "The Golden Bough" are a monument of industry and painstaking research and wide reading. These tomes are a ready arsenal eagerly ransacked by the writers of text-books on Sociology who are on the lookout for "facts" in illustration of evolutionary theories of culture. Then, too, quotations from "The Golden Bough" look learned and imposing.

As references to this work recur persistently in recent sociologic texts, chiefly with the purpose of supporting evolutionary theories of culture and religion, it is worth while to quote the opinion of one of the real leaders in ethnologic science on its value to science.

In volume VII of "Anthropos" [1] (1912) page 259, Rev. P..W. Schmidt, S. V. D., reviews "The Golden Bough. A Study in Magic

[1] "International Review of Ethnology and Linguistics." St. Gabriel—Mödling bei Wien, Österreich.

ST ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

and Religion Part I, Part II, and Part III." Referring to his huge mass of facts, Frazer himself admits in the preface to the second edition; "Hypotheses are necessarily but often temporary bridges built to connect isolated facts. If my light bridges should sooner or later break down, I hope that my book may still have its utility and its interest as a repertory of facts. Again, in the preface to the third edition, he admits "the slenderness of the foundations" of the whole theory of his work.

Fr. Schmidt comments as follows: "It is, perhaps, this readiness of Mr. Frazer to give up his own theories, to swallow, like Kronos, his own children, that has contributed to the fact that if his works are universally appreciated as most valuable collections of facts, his theories have found relatively few adherents.

"As I have said, I wonder, and it is a psychological enigma to me, why Mr. Frazer, ready to give up so many theories that he might be styled an absolute skeptic, is so enthusiastic in defending absolute truth in one determined direction? If Mr. Frazer himself has already so many times changed the direction of his guns, why should it not be possible to direct

them also in a direction quite opposed to that in which he intended to direct them formerly?

"But it should be accentuated still more that Mr. Frazer himself declares expressly that he has not the ambition to give his work as true science, which has never been otherwise defined than as certain and evident knowledge. Mr. Frazer is in so high a degree, and to so large an extent, contented with mere probabilities and plausibilities, with 'Anschaulichkeiten,' as we say in German, that one may doubt if he takes his works as creations of a scientist or as creations of an artist, a poet. And in this doubt one may be confirmed by seeing how much weight Mr. Frazer seems to give to 'Stimmungen,' and how he endeavors to produce them in his readers by his picturesque descriptions which, indeed, are often wonderful. It is clear that on the general reader he exerts, by such means, the same mighty influence which always proceeds from poetical creation. But, naturally, poetical beauties cannot be, for ever, substitutes for firm and solid truths, and so, I fear, many of the theories of Mr. Frazer will be detected to be no more than very spirited *lusus ingenii* (Plays of fancy), which are aban-

doned as soon as the simple and grave power of truth appears.

"Now, if some of Mr. Frazer's theories are rejected by their own creator, if others are overthrown by deeper researches of other scholars, is it not possible that nothing is left of the terrible "guns" but the ammunition which was intended to serve them? But with regard to ammunition, Mr. Frazer knows himself very well that it is quite indifferent to what guns it is charged in, if they be of the right calibre. May it not be that they could be used to destroy just that position which Mr. Frazer had the intention to defend?"

I. Evolutionary Theories of Culture Rejected by Anthropologists

Frazer has been so widely acclaimed because his immense congeries of data are supposed by some to lend weight to his theory that cultural progress necessarily follows rigid lines, and that one stage of advance imperatively demands a definite antecedent. The world-famous editor of "Anthropos" does not stand alone in his rejection of this theory. It is now abandoned by all the larger ethnologists. Dr. Robert Lowie, of the University of California, readily accounts for the growth of this "theory." He says: "When evolutionary principles, having gained general acceptance in biology, had begun to affect all philosophical thinking, it was natural to extend them to the sphere of social phenomena. Among the first to embark on this venture was Lewis H. Morgan, whose ethnographical treatise on the Iroquois had established his reputation as an accurate and sympathetic observer of primitive custom. Under the

influence of evolutionary doctrines Morgan outlined a complete scheme for the development of human marriage. It was eminently characteristic of the intellectual atmosphere of the period that Morgan's first stage should be a condition of perfect promiscuity. . . . Morgan made no pretense at producing empirical proof of pristine promiscuity. . . . He advanced promiscuity as a logical postulate precisely as some evolutionary philosophers advance the axiom of spontaneous generation; and thereby placed it beyond the range of scientific discussion." [1]

Again, in his book "Culture and Ethnology," [2] Dr. Lowie discussing "The Determinants of Culture" (Chapter IV) says: "What are the determinants of culture? We have found that cultural traits may be transmitted from without and in so far forth are determined by the culture of an alien people. The extraordinary extent to which such diffusion has taken place proves that the actual development of a given culture does not conform to innate laws necessarily leading to definite results, such

[1] "Primitive Society," Boni and Liveright. New York, 1920.
[2] New York, Douglas C. McMurtrie, 1917.

hypothetical laws being overridden by contact with foreign peoples. But even where a culture is of a relatively indigenous growth, comparison with other cultures suggests that one step does not necessarily lead to another, that an invention like the wheel or the domestication of an animal occurs in one place and does not occur in another. To the extent of such diversity we must abandon the quest for general formulæ of cultural evolution and recognize as the determinant of a phenomenon the unique course of its past history. . . . And as the engineer calls on the physicist for a knowledge of mechanical laws, so the social builder of the future who would seek to refashion the culture of his time and add to its cultural values will seek guidance from ethnology, the science of culture." (Pages 95–97.)

Dr. Clark Wissler, of the American Museum of Natural History, defends "the historical conception of culture" as opposed to the evolutionary scheme.[1] The "historical school" in ethnology and the science of man is gradually gaining wider recognition among students of

[1] "The American Indian: An Introduction to the Anthropology of the New World," New York, Douglas C. McMurtrie, 1917.

primitive society. Under the caption "The Historical Conception of Culture" (page 352, *l. c.*) Dr. Wissler writes: "Sociology and Anthropology have sought to interpret culture as the mere expression of organic evolution, but such interpretations could not be made consistent with the data. Heredity did not appear to perpetuate the different forms of culture found in the world, nor could it in any way account for the cultural associations formed by the historical nations. A good illustration of this difficulty is found in language; everyone knows that a language is not inherited, for if such were the case, a person would speak French, Algonquin or Chinese according to his parentage, and not according to his first associates. Neither are shooting with bows or kindling fire with fire drills inherited. Yet such are the elements that constitute culture—complexes. It appears, then, that the form and direction the development of culture takes is something of another sort from that followed by organic evolution, because the perpetuating mechanism is not the same. Further, the knowledge we now possess of culture prohibits any fundamental distinctions in this respect between, say, the Eskimo

and the English, for in neither case is the particular form of culture perpetuated by direct inheritance. The phenomenon of English culture is made the subject matter of English history, but it is a fair assumption that the causes that operate in it are of the same general type as those that operate in Eskimoan culture. Hence, in dealing with problems of culture, we must take our points of regard from the historian because he deals with the phenomena where the approaches are most complete and direct. We assume, therefore, that the culture complex of the Eskimo grew up in the same manner as that of England and is, in other words, a historical fact. Both are conceived of as perpetuated and evolved by social mechanisms. On the other hand, the straight black hair of the New World native and the more specific cephalic character of the Eskimo are not facts of the same series and are perpetuated by a mechanism we call inheritance.

"It seems strange that these two series of facts should be continually confused to the extent of reading the interpretations arising from one directly into the structure of the other. In so far, then, as anthropology deals with culture,

which is, after all, the only distinctly human phenomenon in the objective sense, it conceives of it as historical phenomena and this conception is in so far the soul of its method."

In fact, modern ethnologic science, as represented by Lowie, Wissler, Kröber, and Laufer in America, and Schmidt, Koppers, and Gräbner in Europe, has done away with the antiquated notions and "high-piling" evolutionary hypotheses of L. H. Morgan and Herbert Spencer.[1] Ethnology is now recognized as the only science that can furnish the data absolutely necessary for the earlier story of human progress. This fact seems to be ignored by many of the text-book makers. They are apparently unaware of the rapid progress that ethnologic research has made during the last forty years. There are ambitious chapters on "Social Evolution" in some of the text-books on sociology, in which the old theories of Spencer and Lubbock are handed down as if they still held good today. Some of these

[1] The new theory on the development of culture, propounded especially by the editors of "Anthropos" and by Dr. F. Gräbner, is known as the "Kulturkreis theorie" and explains many cultural phenomena as "diffusions" from one central source or point of origin.

pedagogs seem not to know that the elaborate classifications of forms of human association in Morgan's "Ancient Society" are no longer held by anthropologists, that Spencer's "Principles of Sociology" is a "compilation based on materials collected by assistants," and propounds views which now "are ignored by ethnologists," [1] and that the multitudinous data of Frazer's "The Golden Bough" may prove anything, and, as a matter of fact, have received most diverse interpretations at the hands of students of primitive culture and folklore.

[1] "Source Book for Social Origins," by W. I. Thomas, Chicago, 1919.

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

II. Evolutionary Theories of Culture Opposed by Facts

When the facts alleged to prove a strict evolutionary development of culture were carefully examined, it was seen on how insecure a basis the whole theory rested. Lowie [1] therefore asserts, that "in view of the evidence, it seems perfect nonsense to say that early European civilization, by some law inherent in the very nature of culture, developed in the way indicated by archæologic finds."

For the "line of progress" may be broken anywhere, at any time, and owing to ever so many causes. One principle that is gaining the support of many recent Ethnologists is the "principle of convergence," *i. e.*, the doctrine that similar cultural traits may develop from unlike antecedents.[2] This would effectively annihilate the "stages" laid down by the

[1] "The Determinants of Culture," in "Culture and Ethnology," New York, 1917.

[2] Dr. Frederic Schleiter develops this theory in his book "Religion and Culture" (Lemcke and Buechner, New York).

Spencer-Morgan school. In fact, says Lowie, "discontinuity is a necessary feature of cultural progress" (*l. c.*, page 80). "The classical scheme of cultural evolution, of which men like Morgan are the protagonists" is that cultural development is in a definite direction through definite stages. But "Professor Boas and American ethnologists generally have maintained (that) many facts are quite inconsistent with the theory of unilinear evolution. That theory can be tested very simply by comparing the sequence of events in two or more areas in which independent development has taken place." For instance, though Africa has deposits of copper, the Stone Age of the Dark Continent was *not* followed by a Copper Age, but directly by a period of Iron. Southern Scandinavia, however, had no copper deposits. But this region not only had "a bronze age" but the people even excelled in certain kinds of bronze work. The fact can only be explained by influences from without, or by contact with tribes possessing a higher degree of civilization. Again, people make different uses of their cultural possessions. The Tungus, a Mongolian people, chiefly nomads, dwelling in eastern and

central Siberia, ride their reindeer, while other Siberian tribes harness them to a sledge. Facts like these justify the inference that cultural phenomena "cannot involve the assumption of an organic law of cultural evolution that would necessarily produce the observed effect."

Dr. W. I. Thomas is equally emphatic in asserting that we cannot "look too curiously into the order of emergence of inventions, nor assume a straight and uniform line of development among all races." Again "the attempt to classify culture by epochs is similarly doomed to failure when made too absolutely. The frugivorous, the hunting, the pastoral, and the agricultural are the stages usually assumed. But the Indian was a hunter while his squaw was an agriculturist. The African is pastoral, agricultural or hunting indifferently, without regard to his cultural status. And the ancient Mexicans were agricultural but had never had a pastoral period." ("Source Book for Social Origins," page 25.)

It is worthy of note that two of the ethnologists mentioned above, Fr. Koppers and Dr. Lowie, have arrived independently at impor-

tant conclusions which have shaken the foundations of all strictly evolutionary explanations of social progress, that is, evolutionary, in the sense of Herbert Spencer and J. G. Frazer, who want, by all means, to establish the theory of a painful ascent of man from a herd-like condition. These conclusions effectively demolish, at the same time, the basis of materialistic socialism.

No Basis for the Theory of Sexual Promiscuity

The most important of these conclusions is that among "primitives" there exists a well regulated family life, and that there is no evidence of a widespread promiscuity.

In his Retiring Address as President of the Anthropological Society of Washington (May, 1917), Dr. John R. Swanton, of the Bureau of American Ethnology, referred to "theories of sexual promiscuity" as follows:

"When the basal facts, upon which they (these theories) rested, were critically examined, only another house of cards was revealed. It had to be admitted that the stage of absolute promiscuity exists

nowhere today and must remain purely hypothetical, that the cases of so-called group marriage are ridiculously few to form a base for such a structure, that polyandry and polygamy existed side by side with monogamy, and were largely to be explained by economic and social conditions, and could not be shown to be older than the monogamy which they accompanied " [1]

Dr. R. H. Lowie takes this position and cites further evidence. He refers on page 54 of "Primitive Society" to "the pretentious terms *group marriage* or *sexual communism,*" as employed by shallow evolutionists. Again (page 40), he says: "Polygamy is one of those dangerous catchwords that requires careful scrutiny lest there result a total misunderstanding of the conditions it is meant to characterize." Hasty travelers who pretend to know much about "sexual communism" among primitives, are the last to give heed to this admonition about "careful scrutiny."

Isolated cases of "communism" have been reported and should be admitted as far as they

[1] "American Anthropologist," New Series XIX (1917), 459-470.

can be verified, though they are of no value whatever in establishing that phenomenon as a "stage" through which man necessarily passed. Dr. Lowie says (*l. c.* page 52): "Sexual communism as a normal condition, thus excluding individual marriage, has been confidently ascribed to the Urabunna and Dieri, two Australian tribes inhabiting the vicinity of Lake Eyre. Owing to the fragmentary nature of the Urabunna evidence, it will be ignored in favor of that from the Dieri."

But "in all this the two most significant facts are: (a) that a wife invariably takes precedence over the concubine when both occupy the same camp; and (b) that the husband—the duly affianced spouse—enjoys an undisputed preëmptive right over his wife." (*L. c.*, page 53.)

Dr. Lowie quotes Dr. Malinowski to the effect that "to leap from the fact that more than one man may have access to a woman to the conclusion that there is an institution of group marriage is little short of absurd."

The Gilyak of the Amur region, a province in eastern Siberia, have also been reported as

practicing sexual communism to the exclusion of individual marriage. "The data, however, are of so inadequate a character that they may be ignored until additional information is available. Considering the extreme paucity of all the reported cases of 'group marriage' and the results of our analysis of the sexual communism found among the Chukchi and the Dieri, we are justified in concluding that hitherto no evidence has been adduced to show that any people in the world have in recent times practiced sexual communism in a manner destructive of the individual family." (Lowie page 55.) This verdict is concurred in by Waldemar Bogoras who has made extensive researches among the Chukchi of north-eastern Siberia, and by B. Malinowski, in his book "The Family among the Australian Aborigines."

L. H. Morgan's Absurd References to Hawaiian Tribes

We have already said that L. H. Morgan in his book "Ancient Society" (1877) "made no pretense at producing empirical proof of pris-

tine promiscuity." But he was so carried away by his preconceptions that not having found just what he wanted among the American aborigines to fit in his classificatory scheme, he went to the tribes of Polynesia. But, says Lowie (*l. c.* page 57), "had Morgan not been smitten with purblindness by his theoretical prepossessions, he might well have paused before ascribing to the Polynesians the part they play in his scheme. For the aboriginal civilization of Polynesia, instead of suggesting by its crudeness an extreme antiquity for any and all of its constituents, must rank among the very noblest of cultures devoid of the metallurgical art. When Morgan assigned to this settled, politically organized and marvelously æsthetic race the lowest status among surviving divisions of mankind he attained the high-water level of absurdity, which accounts of Oceanian exploration accessible even in his day, would have sufficed to expose."

All these conclusions, so clearly expressed and so well documented (notice the list of first-hand authorities at the end of every chapter in Lowie's book), have also been reached by Rev.

Dr. William Koppers, S. V. D., Assistant Editor of "Anthropos." In November 1922 he returned to Austria after a successful expedition to Tierra del Fuego. While among the Indians, who are considered extremely low in the scale of culture, he was initiated in the secret societies of the tribe, and so had every opportunity to learn their religious customs and social practices. He found a relatively high degree of monotheism, knowledge of the precepts of morality, and the monogamous family.

In a work published in 1921 [1] this eminent ethnologist studies in seven chapters such important questions as "The first forms of property," "The primitive family and the primitive state," and "The beginning of religion and morality." The entire investigation is not on *a priori* grounds, but in the light of data supplied by most recent ethnologic research.

Morgan's "Ancient Society" Untrustworthy

The work is especially noteworthy for its

[1] "Die Anfänge des menschlichen Gemeinschaftslebens im Spiegel der neueren Völkerkunde." Volksvereins-Verlag, M. Gladbach.

splendid refutation of the pillars of materialistic socialism. Marx, Kautsky, and Bebel knew no better "source" for their wild theories concerning the "evolution" of the family from a "stage of promiscuity," than Morgan's farfetched and unproven "lines of human progress." "Ancient Society" became the Bible of German materialistic socialism though, as is now admitted, the book is hopelessly antiquated. "In forty-three years so much has been done that it seems hardly worth while spending so much time noticing the arguments which are now no longer put forth." [1]

Nor do we care to notice any of the vagaries of Morgan. It is more to the point to give some of the positive testimony adduced by Dr. Koppers in favor of the presence among "primitives" of two most important institutions of human society—the monogamous family and private property. This testimony is of the highest order, since it is given by scholars who devoted special attention to the tribes whose cultural life they have described. Dr. E. H. Man's work "On the Aboriginal Inhabitants

[1] "The American Journal of Sociology," September, 1921. (P. 243.) See also "Preface" to "Primitive Society."

of the Andaman Islands" (London 1883) is characterized by Prof. W. I. Thomas as "the best report" on the subject.

Purity of Family Life Among Andaman Islanders

Man says: "We have been told that the system of communal marriage prevails among them, and that marriage is nothing more than providing oneself with a slave. But the marriage contract is so far from being a temporary makeshift, which can be disregarded at the will of either one of the two parties, that not even difference of temperament or any other cause can sunder the union. While polygamy, polyandry and divorce are unknown, marital fidelity unto death is not the exception, but the rule. Domestic quarrels, which are of rather rare occurrence, are easily settled with or without intervention of friends."

Among the Negritos of the Malay Peninsula

W. W. Skeat, who has written "one of the

best studies" on Malay Magic, is the co-author with C. E. Blagden, of "Pagan Races of the Malay Peninsula." (2 vols. London, 1906.) Skeat says of the Negritos: "All indications point to the fact that once married, the parties remain true to one another, and cases of infidelity are extremely rare."

B. Malinowski says in his "The Family Among the Australian Aborigines" (1913), that "in the majority of cases marriage lasts for life, or at least for a long time. But in any case the opinion that the primitive family is an unstable organization—forming and reforming itself—very often under the impulse of the moment without any regard for life-partnership, is proven absolutely false in the light of Australian data." Finally, W. H. R. Rivers, an eminent English anthropologist, says that the prevailing tendency in anthropology is opposed to every theory which would derive human society from a condition of promiscuity, whether the latter be of the type properly so-called, or exist in the form of group marriage.[1]

[1] "Anthropological Essays presented to E. B. Tylor," Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1907. (P. 309.)

Professor Wundt [1] of Leipzig says: "What is the condition of marriage and the family in this stage (Urstufe)? To one accepting the widespread hypothesis about the primitive herd-like condition the answer is surprising. . . . Everywhere among these tribes, you find monogamy not only as the prevailing type of marriage, but as it were, as the one most natural,—one man living with one woman for life."

[1] "Elemente der Vœlkerpsychologie" (Leipzig, 1912, pp. 35-51).

III. Treatment of Children and Position of Women Among Primitives

The treatment of children and of old persons among primitives is what, in the light of modern standards, may be called humane. This finding is opposed to evolutionary speculations, according to which barbarism and brute force rule primitive tribes, while altruism and consideration for the weaker brethren come only at a later stage. So say the evolutionists. What are the facts?

E. H. Man states expressly that child murder is unknown among the Andaman Islanders. And it is generally admitted that these people, as well as the Bushmen of South Africa, the Australian aborigines, and the Fuegians of South America, are "the lowest peoples in the point of culture."

A. W. Howitt says in "The Native Tribes of Southeast Australia" (London, 1904) that "in his childhood the young Kurnai is an object of pride and of love on the part of father

and mother. From my own observation among different tribes in widely separated parts of Australia, I can confidently say that love of children is a characteristic trait of the aborigines."

Howitt has described the initiatory rites for young men practiced among the Kurnai of Southeast Australia. At these ceremonies the young men are introduced to the knowledge of Mungan ngaua (our Father) by the chieftain. In connection with this instruction the young men are taught the following moral lessons:

1. To listen to their parents and to obey them.

2. To share their possessions with their friends.

3. To live in peace with their associates.

4. To respect the chastity of girls and married women.

5. To observe the food-laws until they are dispensed therefrom by their elders.

In view of this relationship between parent and child, says Fr. Koppers (*l. c.* page 125) it is improbable that the child grew up without any instruction. Of course, the contrary is asserted by numerous writers. But this view is today a thing of the past. It is contradicted

by first-hand evidence showing the training and even careful upbringing bestowed upon their children by primitives.

C. G. and B. Z. Seligmann (The Veddas, Cambridge, 1911) say: "When a child is about six or eight years of age it is expected that he will behave properly of his own accord, and strange to say, this is the case. "The Veddas give systematic instruction to the boys in the collection of honey and in hunting, while the girl is taught how to gather plants. And this ancient and probably aboriginal people of Ceylon, is considered "among the lowest in culture." In the Ewahlayi tribe, in the northwestern part of New South Wales, the mother even sings a ditty to her babe which contains sound advice for the future years:

> "Be good, steal not;
> Touch not what belongs to others;
> Let all things stay where they are;
> Be good."

As regards the Negritos of the Philippine Islands, A. B. Meyer says: "As soon as the old persons can no longer support themselves, they are taken care of by their respective families."

It was worth while to cite these instances of mutual love of parents and children among primitives, because Prof. W. G. Sumner gives some distressing examples of treatment of old folks by the young, among the Yakuts of northeast Siberia. Such conduct, even the putting to death of the aged and the feeble, may be partially explained by the terrible and persistent struggle of man in the Arctic region for his daily sustenance. For those who are guilty of the crime of murder, sometimes give as an excuse that the old are no longer able to do their share in providing food, and should make room for the young and the strong. This attempted justification of their wickedness shows that they have at least some idea of the natural law, though it may have been blunted by the adverse conditions in which man in a harsh environment must gain his daily competence. In fact, we are told of these people that though they may be cruel to the old folks, they practice charity towards the helpless. For "impoverished families are cared for in their houses, while the helpless and paupers go about amongst the householders and take their places

at the table with the members." (Thomas, "Source Book for Social Origins," page 80.)

Position of Woman in Primitive Society

The position of woman in any society is a fair index of its cultural status. Evolutionists seem to take pride in pointing to the "degraded condition" of woman in all primitive societies. They depict her as an abject slave of her physically stronger consort, loaded down with intolerable burdens, driven and maltreated like an animal. The man is alleged to have taken things easy, to have had "a good time" in sport and revelry. Hence there can be no question of the equal position of man and woman in the primitive family (Urfamilie). So say Lubbock, and that profound socialist thinker, Bebel.

But scholarly research gives us just the reverse of this imaginative picture. What we have already said about prevalence of monogamy shows that the picture drawn by the evolutionary delirium is false. Those students who had opportunity to study particular tribes

more intimately admit this charge against the evolutionists.

Seligmann writes in his afore-cited book on the Veddas that "In every respect women seem to be treated equally with men; they eat the same food, and when we gave the men presents of eatables, they apparently offered the women and children their share. Howitt knew of several cases among the Kulin and Chepara, tribes of Southeast Australia, of men carrying their wives, who were too old or infirm, over long distances. Man says of the Andaman Islanders that they treat their wives in such a considerate manner, as to be models for certain classes among European nations.

Seldom has popular fallacy run riot so wildly as in this point—the condition of woman in primitive society. Mr. J. N. B. Hewitt says that this is the case concerning woman among the American Indians. He writes:

"One of the most erroneous beliefs relating to the status and condition of the American Indian woman is that she was, both before and after marriage, the abject slave and drudge of the men of her tribe in general. This view, due largely to inaccurate observation and miscon-

ception, was correct, perhaps, at times, as to a small percentage of the tribes and peoples whose social organization was of the most elementary kind, politically and ceremonially, and especially of such tribes as were non-agricultural."

Mr. Hewitt then quotes several authorities on the treatment of Indian women by the stronger sex, and continues:

"From what has been said it is evident that the authority possessed by the Indian husband over his wife or wives was far from being as absolute as represented by careless observers, and there is certainly no ground for saying that the Indians generally kept their women in a condition of absolute subjection. The available data show that while the married woman, because of her status as such, became a member of her husband's household and owed him certain important duties and obligations, she enjoyed a large measure of independence and was treated with great consideration and deference, and had a marked influence over her husband. Of course, various tribes had different conditions to face, and possessed different institutions, and so it happens that in some tribes the wife was

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

the equal of her husband, and in others she was his superior in many things, as among the Iroquois and tribes similarly organized." [1]

The Family Among African Primitives

Let us pass from the plains and mountains of America to the deserts and virgin forests of Africa. Here we have a witness of unimpeachable authority. It is Bishop Le Roy who wrote a book on "The Religion of the Primitives," but did not write it until he had spent thirty-two years with his black flock. He went to Africa in 1877, beginning work there on the East coast, and published his book in 1909. He possesses a thorough knowledge of the language of the Bantu, and was enrolled as a member of one of their totemistic societies.

Bishop Le Roy [2] says at the beginning of his first chapter on "The Primitive and the

[1] "Handbook of American Indians North of Mexico." Bureau American Ethnology, Bulletin 30. Part 2. Art. Woman.

[2] "La Religion des Primitifs" Par Mgr. Le Roy, Paris, 1909. An English translation of this scholarly work has been prepared by Rev. Newton Thompson, under the title "The Religion of the Primitives." It is published by the Macmillan Company. The publishers' notice correctly says of it that it is "a missionary work that reads like a fascinating adventure

Family," that "among primitive tribes of Africa, as well as those of other countries, the family is the central pillar with which religion and the whole social life is linked; if the family is solidly established, the tribe is prosperous. But if it breaks up, the tribe becomes weakened; and if, as happens on the Coast and in European districts, it is dissolved entirely, the tribe disappears."

Taking up the wild statement of a French sociologist, Gustave Le Bon, who says that at the beginning of human society we find everywhere "la promiscuité générale," Bishop Le Roy says: "It is possible that this herd-like condition may have existed among some human groups (quelques groupements humains) especially wretched. But before changing such an hypothesis into an incontestable truth, it would be wise to establish it by definite facts. The one certain fact is this, that nowhere in Africa today can we find traces of this promiscuity except in the vast steppes of the eastern and southern zones—among herds of antelopes.

story. A new and attractive exploration into the depths of the human soul. One long proof that men are incurably religious."

As to man, the closer we come towards the people of a general primitive nature (d'aspect général primitif), as are the Negritos and the Sân, the more evidence we find of family life, of the family precisely as the fundamental, necessary and unshaken basis of society."

It is gratifying to place this clear testimony, so directly opposed to the "stage of sexual communism as it is pictured by Morgan's school," beside the equally vigorous conclusion of Dr. Lowie: "Sexual communism as a condition taking the place of the individual family exists nowhere at the present time; and the arguments for its former existence must be rejected as unsatisfactory. This conclusion will find confirmation in the phenomena of primitive family life" (*l. c.* page 62).

Primitive Family Life

Perhaps nowhere in the field of social history have unscientific views been accepted so naïvely as "established," as in the question of family life among primitives. Though from what has already been said of the high status of marriage among primitives, the stability of their

family life would follow as a legitimate deduction, it may be in place to add further proof. Moreover, the perverse teachings of Bebel, in "Die Frau und der Socialismus (Woman and Socialism), of Marx, of Engels, as well as of some American and English socialists, have gained wide currency, and some of their opinions even color chapters on "The Family" in sociologic textbooks. Be it said at once that the researches of modern ethnology absolutely reject their unfounded theories.

When Morgan applied strict evolutionary theories to his treatment of the progress of society, the afore-cited socialist writers imagined that these theories would serve as the solid foundation of Materialistic Socialism. In fact, Engels has been accused of blindly copying Morgan in his book "The Origin of the Family." Morgan, though his theories are now rejected, was at least an ethnologist of repute. Engels, however, was an amateur and accepted any opinion that lent itself to his speculations.

Just as the book of Engels is full of misstatements and false assumptions when examined in the light of recent scientific ethnology, so too

unreliable in as far as it is based on conclusions is Bebel's "Woman and Socialism" absolutely of the old ethnology. But these conclusions, unfortunately for Bebel, form the mainstay of his procedure.

A True Picture of the Primitive Family

Lowie's admirable summary of the high status of primitive family life will dispense with further illustrations. He speaks of the amicable division of labor between man and wife, which is found among the lower races, and continues: "In Central Australia there is a similar division of labor and from Dr. Malinowski's compilation of facts it is clear that throughout the continent the individual family on this basis normally constitutes a definitely segregated unit. As Mr. Brown remarks regarding the West Australian Kariera, 'the unit of social life in the Kariera tribe was the family, consisting of a man and his wife or wives and their children. Such a unit might move about by itself without reference to the movements of the other families of the local group. In the camp each family had its own hut or shelter with its own fire. The family had

its own food supply which was cooked and consumed by the family. The man provided the flesh food and his wife provided the vegetable food and such things as small mammals or lizards.' The economic and industrial relations of the Ewe mates are regulated with equal definiteness. It is the husband's duty to furnish meat and fish, and the wife's to supply salt; both share the horticultural work; the woman spins, while the man weaves and mends the clothing.

"Such facts might be multiplied indefinitely. On the strength of this universal trait we are justified in concluding that regardless of all other social arrangements the individual family is an omnipresent social unit." ("Primitive Society," page 66.)

IV. Private Property Among Primitives

As socialist writers like Engels and Bebel repeat *ad nauseam* that the monogamous family is the product of "slow evolution," so, too, would they try to make their adherents believe that the "property sense," is a matter of "social evolution." In fact, socialists sometimes assert that the Christian Church has carefully developed these two institutions for its own selfish (!) purpose, and in order to play into the hands of the wealthier classes. Even in some of the sociologic texts we may find references to the growth of the idea of "private property." It seems that evolutionary spectacles make some writers blind to facts.

For what are the facts in the case? The answer is that the primitives, namely the tribes lowest in the cultural scale, have a fully developed notion of private property. Hence it is nonsense to speak of "the evolution of that idea."

Why do Socialists Reject the Fact of Private Property Among Primitives?

We find the answer to this question in Lowie's words: "Those who set out with the evolutionary dogma that every social condition now found in civilization must have developed from some condition far removed from it through a series of transitional stages, will consistently embrace the hypothesis that the property sense so highly developed with us was wholly or largely wanting in primitive society, that it must have evolved from its direct antithesis, communism in goods of every kind. This assumption is demonstrably false" (*l. c.* page 205).

Verily, in this case, the wish was "father of the thought." Nor does it help the evolutionist much to quote Sir Henry Maine's "Ancient Law" who holds "that joint-ownership and not separate ownership is the really archaic institution." For as Lowie adds, "joint-ownership is by no means necessarily communal ownership." It may be explained by peculiar social conditions, or systems of kinship, obtaining among some people.

Who Are the "Primitives"?

Anthropologic science today recognizes certain tribes as lowest in the point of culture. They are not the American Indians but "certain isolated groups that live almost in a state of nature, without any attempt to cultivate the soil or to control nature in other respects." (Ellwood-Sociology and Modern Social Problems, page 93.) Among them are the Australian Aborigines, the Veddahs of Ceylon, the Fuegians of Tierra del Fuego (lately visited by Rev. Dr. Koppers), the Bushmen (also called Pygmies) of South Africa, the Negritos (a Pygmean people) of the Philippine Islands and of the Andaman Islands.

The verdict of Ethnology, as just stated, is that individuals of these tribes possessed private property, in the modern acceptance of the phrase. Rev. Dr. Koppers has a chapter on "The First Forms of Property" in his book on "The Beginnings of Human Society in the Light of Recent Ethnology." It is a real pleasure to read a chapter of this kind. Here there are no groundless suppositions, no "assumptions based on indirect evidence," no clauses

like "we may now suppose," "we may readily believe," etc., but statements of facts.

Fr. Koppers first subjects the theory of a primitive communism in land to criticism, and shows how even this theory does not hold good in the light of ethnologic facts. Upholders of "land Communism" pointed to the Russian "Mir," local, rural communities, in which the land is held in common, the parts of it devoted to cultivation being allotted by general vote to the several families for varying terms. But this institution dates back only to the 13th Century, while other communistic ventures arose only in the 18th. It is rather strange, comments Fr. Koppers, to attempt to prove original communal possession in land, from such examples.

Private Property in Food-Stuffs

As to the acquisition and consumption of food-stuffs, evolutionary theories take two directions. Some writers hold that they were held in communal possession, others, led by Karl Buecher, maintain that the individual kept everything for himself (individuelle Nahrungs-

suche). Neither of the two opinions is correct.

We have already pointed out the fixed status of the primitive family, and herein the Pygmean peoples (Bushmen and Negritos) rank deservedly high. If the family is a stable social unit (consisting of man, wife and children), it follows that it is also an economic unit. The food belonged to the family. And here we see the old sociologic commonplace strikingly illustrated—that the family was the first economical unit, in as much as the economic life of all the peoples first centered about the household; and that within the family the first division of labor takes place, the first cooperation between individuals.

Is all this true of the "Primitives"? Absolutely so. The more primitive a people, and the more it represents, what for want of a better term, may be called "the acquisitive type," the more clearly the domestic or family character of its economic life appears. And this holds good for the production, as well as for the consumption, of food-stuffs. The members of the family, especially man and wife, produce what the same family, with the children, consume.

R. Martin says that this is true of the tribes

of the Malay Peninsula (Die Inlandstämme der Malayischen Halbinsel, Jena 1905, a work characterized by Professor W. I. Thomas as one of the greatest of all German monographs). P. and F. Sarasin and Seligmann say the same of the Veddas of Ceylon, "one of the lowest human groups," while E. H. Man found similar conditions among the people he studied intensely—the Andaman Islanders. But even in these most primitive cultures, eatables are not the only kind of private property. Weapons, tools, garments, canoes, etc., are respected as individual possessions. One of the firm conclusions of modern Ethnology is that nowhere upon earth are found people without these evidences of culture. The Eskimos have often been referred to as practicing primitive communism of goods. But A. N. Gilbertson has shown that what is used by the individual, is likewise individual property, *e. g.*, his kayak or canoe, his hunting-gear, weapons, etc. The high regard of the Eskimo for private property is praised by Cartwright who spent sixteen years among them: "There is no people under the sun to whom I would more willingly entrust my person and property."

The Veddahs and the Bushmen designate with a "mark" beehives discovered by them in the forests or on cliffs, whereby these objects become private property and are respected as such. Man says of the Andaman Islanders that they will not take what belongs to a friend or neighbor. W. W. Skeat gives similar testimony regarding the Aborigines of Malacca.

Private Property in Land

Even as regards private property in "real-estate," lands and fields, the careful study of facts reveals a picture quite different from that described by evolutionists.

It is true that often, not an individual or a family was the owner of land, but a group composed of three, four, or more families. But this is explicable from the prevailing form of economic life. The land is regarded as a hunting ground or a place for gathering herbs. But after individual labor has been expended on the ground, as for instance, when the woman begins agricultural work, the land passes to private ownership. Lowie shows that even when possession was communal, ownership was re-

stricted to certain persons. For "virtual communism for members of the tribe was coupled by these people with zealous exclusion of all aliens. The tribe regarded a certain area as its hereditary grounds, open to exploitation by any native, but it resented trespassing by others. An intruder on Thompson River (British Columbia) territory forfeited his life and the Maidu safeguarded their boundary lines by an elaborate system of sentry service."

Other Instances of Property Right Among American Indians

Dr. Lowie, who studied the Plains Indians most exhaustively, records some interesting observations on the property sense. "It is not less remarkable that sometimes even a child's individual property rights are regarded as inviolable. On a Paviotso (Shoshone) reservation in Nevada I once offered to purchase a little boy's blanket. His parents not only referred the request to him as the rightful owner, but were willing to abide by the ridiculously low price he set, which in fairness I felt obliged to raise." ("Primitive Society," page 233.)

Writing in the Handbook of American Indians (Vol. II, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 30, Washington, 1910), Miss Alice C. Fletcher, a well known authority on Indian life and culture, says: "Broadly speaking, Indian property was personal. Clothing was owned by the wearer, whether man, woman, or child. Weapons and ceremonial paraphernalia belonged to the man; the implements used in cultivating the soil, in preparing food, in dressing skins, and making garments and tent covers, and among the Eskimo the lamp, belonged to the women. In many tribes all raw materials, as meat, corn, and, before the advent of traders, pelts were also her property. Among the tribes of the plains the lodge or tipi was the woman's, but on the N. W. coast the wooden structures belonged to the men of the family. . . . For instance, among the Menominee a family would mark off a section by twisting in a peculiar knot the stalks of wild rice growing along the edge of the section chosen; this knotted mark would be respected by all members of the tribe, and the family could take its own time for gathering the crop. On the Pacific slope, as among the Hupa, vary-

ing lengths of river shore were held as private fishing rights by the heads of families, and these rights passed from father to son, and were always respected. . . . Property marks were placed upon weapons and implements by the Eskimo and by the Indian tribes. A hunter established his claim to an animal by his personal mark upon the arrow which inflicted the fatal wound. Among both the Indians and the Eskimo it was customary to bury with the dead those articles which were the personal property of the deceased, either man or woman. In some of the tribes the distribution of all the property of the dead, including the dwelling, formed part of the funeral ceremonies. . . . Property right in harvest fields obtained among the tribes subsisting mainly on maize or on wild rice. Among the Chippewa the right in wild rice-lands was not based on tribal allotment, but on occupancy. Certain harvest fields were habitually visited by families that eventually took up their temporary or permanent abode at or near the fields; no one disputed their ownership, unless an enemy from another tribe, in which case, might established right."

In fact, not only does the American Indian

hold fast to his material possessions, but even "immaterial goods" like songs, rituals, stories and legends, are private property. For among several tribes the right to a song belonging to a tribesman, can be secured only on payment of "good money."

As regards private tenure of land among the American Aborigines, Dr. Lowie says: "It is often assumed that when people support themselves by the chase there is of necessity communal ownership of the hunting-grounds. This proposition, however, has been not only seriously shaken but invalidated by testimony from a number of distinct regions. . . . If a Thompson River Indian or a Maidu had constructed a deer-fence or fishing station, he was entitled to the exclusive use of what his "individual efforts had produced and the right descended to his heirs. Thanks to Professor Speck's capital investigation of northeastern Algonkian groups, it must now be regarded as an established fact that in parts of North America not only such improvements but the hunting-grounds themselves were the property of individual families. 'The whole territory claimed by each tribe was subdivided into tracts

owned from time immemorial by the same families and handed down from generation to generation. The almost exact bounds of these territories were known and recognized, and trespass, which, indeed, was of rare occurrence, was summarily punishable.' "

"Incorporeal Property" Rights

We have just referred to the American Indian's custom of safeguarding possession of "incorporeal property." Dr. Lowie says on this point (*l. c.* page 235): "Contrary to what might be supposed, the notion of patents or copyrights is well-developed in the lower reaches of civilization and its prominence among certain peoples reduces the dogma of a universal primitive communism to a manifest absurdity. . . . Among the natives of British Columbia the Nootka are conspicuous for the number and variety of their intangible goods." . . . Again, "the individualistic character of incorporeal property is on the whole strongly marked among the Indians of the Plains. . . . I know of a Crow who bought the right of using a special kind of ceremonial paint from

his own mother, and the Hidatsa medicine bundles, uniformly derived from ancestral visions and hereditary in certain families, must nevertheless be bought by sons from their own fathers."

This abundant testimony of the presence of the "property sense" in primitive communities proves the fallacy of the opinion still dogmatically maintained in some texts—that private ownership is a late development. No; among the "Urvœlker," "primitive peoples," we find this important social institution as definitely established as in our own communities.

V. The Theory of a Real "Matriarchy" is Unfounded

The complete title of Morgan's work [1] which has been repeatedly referred to, is "Ancient Society or Researches in the Lines of Human Progress from Savagery through Barbarism to Civilization." The title was unfortunate. For it committed the author to "the proof of a thesis" which he did not prove. The title implies that there was a gradual ascent in culture "from savagery through barbarism to civilization." Whatever general truth may be contained in the phrase that mankind passed through these two preliminary stages to civilization, Morgan's schemes did not establish such a progress.

It is almost inevitable that in drawing up such a scheme of "development," its author will make much of certain "stages of culture."

[1] On account of the blind dependence of Engels' book "The Origin of the Family" on Morgan, the latter has been dubbed "The Church Father of Socialism."

Morgan's work is proof of this tendency. He found it convenient to have a real "matriarchal" stage in the development of society, that is, a period in which all law, power and authority in the tribe, resided in women. If Morgan needed this "stage," so did the evolutionists, to whose interest it was to "prove" that the monogamous family is a very late "development," and ought perhaps eventually give way to something better. It did not matter to Engels and Bebel just when and in what tribes that "stage" obtained. It would fit in somewhere, no matter where, and that was all that was required.

Before showing the fallacy in assuming this stage, a few terms need explanation. Matriarchy, as the Greek derivation suggests, means government by mothers, or an order of society in which the mother takes precedence of the father. If, as is the case in the "Century Dictionary," this precedence be limited to "certain important respects, especially in the line of descent and inheritance," the definition is correct. For there are many tribes reckoning descent not on the father's, but on the mother's side.

In this case, however, it would be better to use the word "metronymic" of an ethnical group in which all relationship is traced to mothers. We also use the phrase "matrilocal residence," when the husband takes up his abode, after marriage, in the house of his parents-in-law.

But a real "matriarchy" in the sense that woman ruled absolutely, and man counted for nothing, never existed. Bachofen, who first developed the theory in "Das Mutterrecht," (1861), is now out of date. He admits that he was influenced by ancient legends, like those of the Amazons. But is legendary lore weightier than the data of science? Lowie refers to "the shopworn anthropological doctrines of half a century ago" which caused some poetic minds "to view primitive woman as undisputed mistress of the family, if not of communal life as well." But "primitive society wears a character rather different than that popularized by Morgan's school." (*L. c.* pages 186 and 427.)

On account of her economic rôle, woman naturally, from the earliest times, was an important factor in the life of the family. But it is not at all certain that on account of this

importance she possessed prerogatives as regards government, among the lower races. The position of women in this respect, among the American Indians, may be taken as fairly representative of her governmental rights among other races. Dr. Hewitt writes in the "Handbook of American Indians" (Part 2, page 973) as follows:

"Some students maintain, on seemingly insufficient grounds, that the institution of maternal descent tends to elevate the social status of woman. Apart from the independence of woman, brought about by purely economic activities arising from the cultivation of the soil, it is doubtful whether woman ever attains any large degree of independence and authority aside from this potent cause. Without a detailed and carefully compiled body of facts concerning the activities and the relations of the sexes, and the relation of each to the various institutions of the community, this question cannot be satisfactorily decided. The data concerning the rights of women as compared with those of men to be found in historical accounts of various tribes are so meager and indefinite

that it is difficult, if not impossible, to define accurately the effect of either female or male descent on the status of woman. It is apparent, however, that among the sedentary and agricultural communities the woman enjoyed a large, if not a preponderating, measure of independence and authority, greater or less in proportion to the extent of the community's dependence for daily sustenance on the product of the woman's activities."

This testimony of the eminent authority on the Iroquois is all the more important, because it was precisely on forms of social organization observed among that tribe, that Morgan spun out his "matriarchal" conception. But, in the first place, what holds good for that tribe, does not necessarily apply to other Indian tribes. Whoever knows anything of the widely different forms of social grouping and organized government of the American Aborigines, from Florida to Alaska, and of their many classifications into clans, gentes, phratries, totemistic societies, etc., will admit this.

In the second place, even if among the Iroquois something bordering on real matriarchy

was in vogue, it must be remembered that this tribe is far from being "primitive" in the sense accepted by modern anthropology, and hence, it would be wrong to argue *a pari* for a similar "stage" elsewhere. In fact, Morgan himself admits ("Ancient Society," Henry Holt & Co., 1877) that "at the time of their discovery they (the Iroquois) were the highest representatives of the Red Race north of New Mexico in intelligence and advancement, although perhaps inferior to some of the Gulf tribes in the arts of life. In the extent and quality of their mental endowments they must be ranked among the highest Indians of America." As an example of the political rights of women among the Iroquois, we mention that an Iroquois clan consisted of one or more kinship groups called *Ohwachira*. The chieftainships were held by these groups. The selection of a person to fill them was made by the child-bearing women of the clan. This privilege can be explained, perhaps, on the ground of the intimate relations that the tribal mothers bore to the warrior-strength of the tribe.

We admit that L. H. Morgan, by his ethnographical treatise on the Iroquois, has "estab-

lished his reputation as an accurate and sympathetic observer of primitive custom," but cannot accept his conclusions. Morgan labored under the handicap of his "preconceived" theories. Besides his "matriarchal" and "promiscuity" stages, he invented another,—the second stage, that of the consanguine family, based on the intermarriage of brothers and sisters, but barring that of parents and children. This stage, "while nowhere observable as a general tribal usage, was inferred by Morgan as the only possible cause of certain empirical phenomena." (Lowie, page 56.)

But the trouble with such "invented" forms is that when disagreeable and unexpected facts present themselves, the beautiful theory collapses. What Professor W. I. Thomas remarks of two writers on primitive society, holds true for Morgan. He says ("Source Book for Social Origins," page 858): "It is a noticeable defect in the work of the type of Westermarck and Herbert Spencer that the writers cannot reconcile with their theories all the ethnological statements which they collect and present. When the fragments are counted and compared, there always remain some excep-

tions, which are treated as exceptions and counted as negligible." But this procedure does not help to strengthen their theories.

Leading Ethnologists Reject "Matriarchy"

The fifth chapter of Dr. Koppers' scholarly work is entitled, "Urfamilie und Urstaat" (Primitive Family and Primitive State). It is a pleasure to read this well-documented chapter, and then compare it with the loose writing of some modern sociologic texts in the treatment of the same subject. Dr. Koppers states that outside socialistic circles the Bachofen-Morgan hypothesis on the "evolution of the family" finds scarcely any defenders. In fact, it is noteworthy that leading ethnologists like E. B. Tylor, Peschel, Ratzel, and Schurtz have never supported it. Historic ethnology has taken the last prop from that hypothesis, inasmuch as Morgan relied for his main proof on the Hawaiians. We have already quoted Dr. Lowie's comment that Morgan "attained the high-water level of absurdity" in doing so. Dr. Koppers is of the same opinion. He affirms that on "the basis of historic ethnologic re-

search these are the least primitive of all the South-sea peoples."

Lowie states explicitly that the theory of matriarchal rule or "the former sovereignty of the female sex," is a notion "now gracing the refuse heaps of anthropologic science." He rejects the theory more forcibly in the following words: "As noted, matrilineal descent was at one time interpreted to mean that women govern not merely the family, but also the primitive equivalent of the state. Probably, there is not a single theoretical conception on which modern anthropologists are so thoroughly in accord as with respect to the utter worthlessness of that inference. The testimony of the ethnographic data is too clear to be swept aside by *a priori* speculation."

After a brief discussion of a so-called matriarchy among the Khasi of Assam (British India), the Iroquois, and the Pueblo Indians, Dr. Lowie concludes that "the foregoing cases supply the *a fortiori* basis that a genuine matriarchate is nowhere to be found." (*L. c.*, pages 171, 189, 191.)

VI. Some Belated Text-Book Opinions

In view of this relegation of the theory among "exploded fallacies," it is strange that a late text by G. S. Dow ("Society and Its Problems," New York, Thomas Y. Crowell Co.), can convey such misinformation as the following: "Bachofen, who is generally given the credit for the authorship of this theory (matriarchy), considered that there was once a period, indefinite in length, during which women ruled. Some writers, including the late Professor Ward, go so far as to say that woman ruled because she was the stronger of the two physically and that she ruled until she lost this superiority of physique. Others, on the contrary, deny that there ever was such a period. However, practically all the leading authorities today recognize some form of matriarchy, although no two definitely agree, and no one is altogether clear in his account of this period. Some think that the period was a long one lasting possibly thousands of years; others,

that it was a comparatively short one; and still others, that it was only a transitional stage, and in many races skipped entirely."

The reference to Lester F. Ward smacks rather of the lurid page that every now and then finds its way into the Sunday Supplement of the newspaper, than of a scientific text-book.

That Dow still labors under such misconceptions as those sponsored by Morgan is evident from another statement. "From matriarchy, or the rule of woman, the pendulum swung to the opposite extreme, that of patriarchy or the rule of man, where the father was the head of the house and ruled not only his wife and children, but also his children's families." (*L. c.*, page 197.)

The more careful study of primitive culture has shown that any isolated phenomena of communism in property, of promiscuity, and of matriarchy, are accompanied by private property, the monogamous family, and paternal organization—forms which according to evolutionists, have been only "gradually developed." In the light of the preceding facts of ethnology, we realize how little remains of their unproven theories.

Before leaving the subject of the "Primitive Family," we add one more specimen of the unscientific character of modern sociologic compends. Dow says (*l. c.*, page 203): "Marriage by capture gave way to marriage by purchase, for the simple reason that man found it easier to buy a wife than to fight for one."

Not a shadow of proof is advanced for the assertion. "It sounds nice" and goes back to Herbert Spencer, Lubbock, and Letourneau. In the light of recent research the opinion must be abandoned. Westermarck gives numerous instances in his chapter on "The Liberty of Choice" ("History of Human Marriage," London, Macmillan & Co., 1901), to show that women had the right of choosing or rejecting their suitors. He says: "In view of such facts it is impossible to agree with M. Letourneau that, during a very long period, woman was married without her wishes being at all consulted." (Page 221.)

Malinowski in his excellent study, "The Family Among the Australian Aborigines" (London, 1913), says that among these tribes "marriage by capture" was the most unusual form of wife-taking.

Among primitives, when a young man desires to take a wife, he generally asks his father or one of his relatives to plead his cause. Among the Andaman Islanders, the father or the uncle of the young man performs this service, while among the Bushmen, it is his sister. As to the Watwa of Urundi (formerly, German East Africa), P. von den Burgt says that "the bride is neither bought nor sold. The girls freely marry men of their choice."

This testimony is confirmed by a missionary, Reverend P. J. Hendle, O. S. B., who worked ten years among tribes of the same district. Writing of the Wapogoro, he says: "The young Wapogoro must patiently and carefully pass through three stages before he becomes the happy possessor of a young bride. Between the first and second stages, there is generally a period of five to twelve or thirteen years; between the second and third, a legal period of six months. Hence, to court a wife is a difficult and protracted affair for the young Negro. The three states may be called 'courting,' 'betrothal,' 'marriage.' The first stage is to prove the young man's inclination towards his bride as well as towards his future parents-

in-law. At the same time it offers not a slight test for the youth's character and power of endurance. When after the expiration of the required time, the bride's mother declares that the young woman is ready for marriage, the youth may come and bring her, accompanied by his parents and relatives, to his own village." [1]

[1] "Anthropos, International Review of Ethnology and Linguistics," Volume VII. 1912, (pp. 252–253).

VII. Frazer's "Golden Bough" Once More

This booklet began with a reference to J. G. Frazer's mass of data collected in "The Golden Bough," and to the use which the author made of the immense congeries of more or less related data. Though not all modern sociologic texts refer directly to his work, nevertheless the thirteen volumes of "The Golden Bough" are often cited in the bibliographies, and his collections are a ready storehouse for the theorizer to prove almost anything in the realm of social development. We now return to the English folklorist to show more fully the theoretical and *a priori* nature of a work which at first blush seems merely an objective presentation of facts.

But we shall see that Frazer starts out with the theory that evolutionary principles alone explain all social progress and social phenomena.

Anthropologists speak of the levirate and sororate—two readily explicable social customs. The former is marriage between a man and his

brother's widow or nearest kinsman under certain circumstances. This is the Biblical meaning of the term. It has another meaning in anthropologic literature, namely, the automatic inheritance of a man's wives by his younger brother or a kinsman ranking as such. The sororate is a custom in virtue of which the several sisters of a family are all regarded as the wives of the man who marries the eldest of them. The custom has been found among several people in the lower stages of civilization.

Now Frazer used both of these institutions to "prove" a theory which he defends—a widespread primitive sexual communism, or group marriage. Dr. Lowie does not agree with him. The interpretations of Morgan and Frazer "are empty guesses which may be disregarded. Levirate and sororate are real institutions intelligible in their context; they are not rendered one whit more intelligible by conceiving them as survivals of a condition that has never been observed" (sexual communism). (*L. c.*, page 62.)

The "London Times Literary Supplement," No. 1090 (Dec. 7, 1922), page 790, reviewing an "Abridgement" of "The Golden Bough,"

says that "His (Frazer's) theories are as children's castles of sand, to be swept away by the rising tide of knowledge. It is as a record of facts that his work will hold."

We have several times referred to his "record of facts" in the course of this paper, and acknowledge the laborious care that has brought them together. But after having pursued his "parallelisms" from Kamchatka to Patagonia, what remains? Nothing worth while, nothing that can be called a solid contribution to the history of culture.

We may just as well argue that because the Norman peasant wears sabots, the Dutch farmer brogans, the Indian moccasins, and the Arabian and Turkish muleteer sandals, and that because in their respective folklores and mythologies they speak of reverence for the "earth-goddess," therefore, foot-gear is worn out of a dread to trample upon this "benign deity," rather than from the prosaic motive of protecting the feet.

Perhaps some day a zealous disciple of Frazer will try to show that the practice of doffing one's hat to a lady goes back to primitive fear of the gentle sex under "matriarchal rule."

This, however, will be quite impossible, as leading anthropologists today agree that a strictly matriarchal régime, that is, a government by women only, never existed. But yet we imagine that Frazer will almost persuade us of the contrary by means of laborious "parallelisms" from the ends of the earth.

Mr. Frazer contributed a series of eight papers on "Folk-Lore in the Old Testament" to "Anthropological Essays Presented to Edward Burnett Tyler" (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1907). Fr. Schmidt, S. V. D. in a brief review of these papers, which attempt to show some "survivals of ancient Semetic paganisms" in the Old Testament ("Anthropos," 1908, Vol. III, page 377) says: "We think the final results are often but little satisfactory. There are too many 'perhaps we may,' 'should it be too bold,' etc., too many guesses and hypotheses in the premises."

As we have observed before, this method of "reasoning" is characteristic of many writers who present an omnium-gatherum of folklore from many tribes, and try to make it "prove" a preconceived theory. If the facts do not

square with the theory, "so much the worse for the facts."

Anthropology, being the study of man, is a noble science, and should not become a source for witticisms. But when we see the wild pranks which some recent writers have played in this field of research, we see the significance of the irony in a clever chapter on "Rain-Making" in Mr. Mitchell's "Anthropology Up-to-Date." [1] Frazer has written largely and interestingly on magic and on belief in charms and amulets, but not always wisely and to the point. Mr. Mitchell says (*l. c.,* page 22) with a reference to "The Golden Bough," Vol. I, Edit. 1900, that "Savages wear all sorts of things about their necks to ward off misfortunes. In modern society some people wear a necktie to cover up a dirty shirt, but such was not its original use. It is primarily of the same nature as a charm. The necktie first came to be worn in the days when men were hung for very trifling offenses. By wearing a piece of rope about the neck a man warded off death by hanging in making this slight concession to the

[1] The Stratford Company, Boston, 1918.

hangman. This is the history of the four-in-hand. As society advanced in culture the necktie was formed to imitate a butterfly. This is the style used by male dancers in evening clothes, and by coercive magic it induces the necessary lightness of foot required for the modern ball-room."

"Inductive processes" as are here deservedly ridiculed, are found in some modern texts on sociology.

VIII. Two American Sociologists on the "Primitive Family"

We are again reminded of the review of Professor G. W. Mitchell's book in *The Dial* (Feb. 22, 1919). It is a little volume which "will thoroughly amuse any intelligent reader for an hour. But it carries a moral for the serious minded. If anthropology can be so easily shown up and legitimately ridiculed, what merit can it still claim? The fact is, there are two streams in the science. One is learned but naïve, comparative but unorganized, finding evolutions and ready explanations at will, and piling hypothesis on hypothesis, as if building high enough on a theory would convert it into fact. This is the anthropology that produces the books on the shelves in well appointed libraries, and that filters into magazines, Sunday supplements, and parlor conversations. The Socialists have made some of it into a party plank; the colleges spread it before thousands of students—often when the teachers are

anthropologists, nearly always when they hail from either biology or from sociology."

The sociology text-books afford numerous instances of the "naïve" anthropologic views spread before "thousands of students" by the teachers who "hail from sociology."

One of the late texts of Professor E. A. Ross furnishes us a telling example.[1] He says in the opening of his chapter on "Preliminary Socialization": "The primordial social grouping arose out of urgent needs and seems to have been a band of mothers with their children." This statement will surely set the anthropologists wondering. Notice, however, the careful use of the word "seems." The professor is wise and won't be caught napping.

He continues: "Owing to his restlessness the male was probably no such stable member of the earlier group as the woman." This profound remark is taken from W. I. Thomas' "Sex and Society" without any further proof. Notice again the "probably," qualifying the statement. But who protected the poor mother from dangers of all kinds—man and beast—

[1] "Principles of Sociology," New York, Century Company, 1921.

during the sire's prolonged absence? Would not the poor woman have been annihilated in her unequal contest with superior enemies, according to the dictum "survival of the fittest"? Still further on, we are told "it is probable that for a period of some tens of thousands of years there was never a human social aggregate larger than the group which could regularly find sufficient food without dispersing." Again, "it is probable." But why not "probable" that this period lasted "three hundred thousand years"? Evidently, when the professor gets into anthropology he is out of his element. This is the kind of anthropology "that filters into magazines, Sunday supplements, and parlor conversations."

Vagaries of Professor Giddings

In a chapter on "The Social Composition," Professor Giddings [1] writes:

"Among savages generally, desertion, divorce and re-marriage are extremely frequent" (page 155).

This is a specimen of the unsound generaliza-

[1] "The Principles of Sociology," New York, The Macmillan Co., 1904.

tion that characterizes a good deal of writing in our sociologic texts. Wild statements of this kind have become traditional in certain schools, while contrary facts are carefully left unnoticed or unexplained. As regards the three social plagues referred to by Professor Giddings we should remember that there is only one nation in the world today which holds a higher (or lower) record than the United States. So we may wonder whether the Professor considers them as evils or as desirable manifestations of social life.

But it is his opinion on "the family life of the primitive man" that we wish to examine. He gives it (*l. c.*, page 264) in the following words: "There is at least a reasonable presumption that the family of the primitive man was an intermediate development between the family of the highest animals and that of the lowest living man. If so, it was a simple pairing family, easily dissolved, and perhaps rarely lasting for life" (page 264). Again we have "perhaps" and "a reasonable presumption." The reader will have noticed that "reasonable presumption," "we may readily imagine," etc., are favorite phrases of Giddings, Ross, Blackmar and

Gillin, etc., whenever they get into the ethnologic field.

In support of his "reasonable presumption," Giddings refers in a footnote to Westermarck, "History of Human Marriage," pages 14, 15 and 50.

But that was unfortunate for Giddings. A careful reading of the pages referred to, shows that not only is there no "reasonable presumption" for Giddings' opinion, but that Westermarck has given no stronger proofs anywhere in his book, for the relatively high moral state of the primitive family.

The sentence in Giddings leading up to the "reasonable presumption" reads as follows:—

"Living in environments more favorable than those of the lowest hordes of today, primitive men were probably often massed in relatively large bands, and their sexual relations may therefore have been even more irregular than those of any existing horde" (page 264). (Please notice the "probably" and the "may have been.")

Now compare this statement with Westermarck (*l. c.*, pages 14 and 15): "With the exception of a few cases in which tribes are

asserted to live together promiscuously, almost all of which assertions I shall prove further on to be groundless,—travelers unanimously agree that in the human race the relations of the sexes are, as a rule, of more or less durable character. The family, consisting of father, mother and offspring, is a universal institution, whether founded on a monogamous, polygamous, or polyandrous marriage."

We "presume" the students in many courses of sociology piously accept such "reasonable presumptions" as above, on the word of the professor, and never think of verifying the "authorities" in the footnotes. We would suggest that they do so hereafter.

All that the Professor can say in answer to the charge of misinterpreting his "sources" is that he refers to the edition of 1891 (in his Bibliography, page 432), whereas the present writer quotes from the third edition (1901); but Professor W. I. Thomas informs us that there are "no important changes from the first edition." In fact, in the latest (fifth) edition of his work (1922), of which a prospectus has just come to hand,[1] Westermarck reiterates his

[1] The Allerton Book Co., 142 E. 59th St., New York, 1922.

earlier opinion more emphatically, and in the light of recent research, in the following heading of Chapter III, Vol. I: "No known savage people living in promiscuity; the hypothesis of a general stage of promiscuity entirely groundless; sexual relations most nearly relating to promiscuity not found among the very lowest races, but among more advanced people."

In conclusion, we quote Westermarck's final sentence from this "Criticism of the Hypothesis of Promiscuity" (Edition of 1901, page 133):

"There is not a shred of genuine evidence for the notion that promiscuity ever formed a general stage in the social history of mankind. The hypothesis of promiscuity, instead of belonging, as Professor Giraud-Teulon thinks, to the class of hypotheses which are scientifically permissible, has no real foundation, and is essentially unscientific."

IX. Anthropologic Science Avoids Far-reaching Hypotheses

But, fortunately, there is another "stream in the science." It is represented by men of laborious research and of careful judgment, who weigh their data and deal less recklessly in far-reaching hypotheses, supported by "probables" and "it seems." The reviewer in *The Dial* refers to this saner pursuit of anthropolic research as the "other current (which) knows that knowledge is difficult and laborious, and devoid of short cuts. It does not hope to solve all problems of human evolution by a series of happy guesses over night, but to work out this story piece by piece, with every recourse to technical skill. Its pronouncements are therefore fragmentary and tentative, like the dicta of true science. This kind of anthropology offers no intellectual panaceas and no stimulus but for the hard thinker. The public naturally has little interest in it. The result is that books like Boas' "Mind of Primitive Man"

and Wissler's "The American Indian," to mention only two examples, have not a tenth the general reputation or influence of the seductively vague and pedantically unsound works of the authors referred to above" (Frazer, Herbert Spencer, Robertson Smith).

The two names—Boas and Wissler—introduce us to the leading names in American Anthropology and Ethnology. Dr. Franz Boas of Columbia University, New York, is our greatest authority on the language, culture and mythology of the Eskimos and the Kwakiutl Indians, and Dean of authorities in American linguistics. Dr. Wissler, together with Dr. Lowie, is the interpreter of the life of the Plains Indians, and as we have seen, they both reject the theory of cultural evolution. Dr. Ales Hrdlicka, of the United States National Museum, is the authority on the physical anthropology of the American Indians, and has rectified the wild guesses of some writers who wished to attribute an extremely ancient age to remains discovered in South America. Dr. Krœber is the minute investigator of the Indians of California, as J. W. Fewkes, the present Director of the Bureau of American Eth-

nology, is of the Moquis of Arizona. Washington Matthews has placed scholars under obligation to him by his careful studies on the Navajos. Berthold Laufer, of the Field Columbian Museum, Chicago, ranks high among students of Chinese and Siberian life and culture. The late A. F. Bandelier has written works which are "the cornerstone of scientific knowledge of the southwestern and Mexican Indian." The late James Mooney has given us the best monograph on the Ghost Dance Religion, and is the scholarly investigator of the Kiowa, Cherokee and Cheyenne Indians. Then there is Father A. G. Morice, famous ethnologist, who has written learnedly on the language and culture of the Western and of the Canadian Denes. Even Charles Lummis may be mentioned here for his charming studies on the Pueblos, which are entirely free from bias and preconceptions, as they are the works of a scholar.

Among European savants who have worked in similar fields and along similar scientific paths, are Bishop Le Roy, a life-long student of the Pygmies, Rev. Fr. Schmidt, S. V. D., luminous expounder of Australian languages

and mythology, and the late Andrew Lang, who brought new life to the study of ancient folklores and mythologies.

When men like these speak, all scholars listen. For to them future generations will be indebted for having preserved the record of the life and thought, the culture and religion, the language and mythology of vanishing races. In their works you find no "high-piling hypothesis," no data blindly accepted on second-hand authorities, no finely worded conditional sentences abounding in "if's," "perhaps," "we may readily imagine," etc., but the result of honest, and often toilsome investigation.

But their names are "conspicuous by their absence" in texts bearing titles like "Principles of Sociology," "Outlines of Sociology" etc., which soon become antiquated, or, at best, serve as "nice books" for round-table conferences of social uplifters.

X. From Evolutionism to Historic Interpretation

Under the title, "The Turning Away from Evolutionism to Historic Methods in American Ethnology," [1] P. W. Schmidt, S. V. D., discusses a number of recent contributions to American Ethnology, all of which, except one, indicate a more or less complete break with older evolutionary theories. Some of these writers have definitely abandoned all evolutionary explanations, regarding them as unsatisfactory in the interpretation of cultural phenomena.

These works are "Primitive Society" (Robert Lowie), "Early Civilization, an Introduction to Anthropology" (A. A. Goldenweiser, New York, 1922), "The Changes in the Material Culture of Two Indian Tribes under the Influence of New Surroundings (E. Nordens-

[1] "Die Abwendung vom Evolutionismus und die Hinwendung zum Historizismus in der Amerikanistik"—Anthropos Band XVI–XVII. (1921–1922.) Heft 1, 2, 3.

kiöld, Göteborg, 1920), "Die Kultur der Kalifornischen Indianer in ihrer Bedeutung für die Ethnologie und die Nordamerikanische Völkerkunde (Fr. Krause, Leipzig, 1921), and "Time Perspective in American Culture. A Study in Method" (E. Sapir, Ottawa, 1916).

Fr. Schmidt refers to Lowie's brilliant refutation of the theories which try to set up a fixed scheme according to which all cultural development has taken place. It is now established that "the search for all-embracing laws of evolution on the model of Morgan's or Schurtz's schemes is a wild-goose chase and that only an intensive ethnographic study in each cultural province can establish the actual sequence of stages."

The viewpoint of Goldenweiser's book is frankly anti-evolutionary and of outspoken historic trend. This is apparent even in the Introduction. After a brief survey of evolutionary schemes, Goldenweiser asks: "Now, what is the verdict of modern ethnology on this generalization? The conclusions derivable from more critical investigations are, in brief, as follows: There seems to be no evidence that a stage of promiscuity ever existed; again,

the condition of group marriage, far from being an universal antecedent of individual marriage, seems to constitute, in the rare instances where it occurs, an outgrowth of a preexisting state of individual marriage. The family and local group are universal forms of social organization, extending to the very beginning."

Dr. Goldenweiser also rejects antiquated evolutionary formulæ in the domain of art and the entire range of economic and industrial life, and compares them with the more exact results of later ethnology. The vital defect of the whole evolutionary process is said to be "the evolutionists' failure to appraise at their true worth the processes of cultural diffusion in the course of historic contact between tribes."

The evolutionists overlook, as Lowie and Wissler have so often pointed out, the importance of "culture contact" of nations, even though at present they be geographically separate. "Culture contact thus appears as the veritable yeast of history, and to disregard it is to develop a blind-spot in one's historic vision, which cannot but prove fatal to any

theory of historic development" (page 26 et sq.).

The work of E. Nordenskiöld cited above, as well as one in German, "Eine geographische und ethnographische Analyse der materiellen Kultur zweier Indianerstämme in El Gran Chaco" (a vast region of Paraguay), are a successful refutation of evolutionary concepts, based on an exhaustive study of aboriginal material culture in the whole of South America. In these two works there are no rigorous "laws of development," but a "vast array of concrete data laboriously gathered."

Dr. Edward Sapir, of the Geological Survey of Canada, states his position very frankly on the first page of his book, "Cultural anthropology (ethnology) is more and more rapidly getting to realise itself as a strictly historical science." He does not believe much in the search for "psychologic laws" as determinants of culture, but pleads for a "thoroughly historical method of interpretation." The writer is, after Dr. Franz Boas, one of the authorities in American linguistics, and it is interesting to learn his opinion as to the richness of Ameri-

can Indian languages. He says: "Popular statements as to the extreme poverty of expression to which primitive languages are doomed are simply myths." (Language, Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York, 1921.)

Summarizing the tendencies of the seven works, of which he gives a searching review in "Anthropos" (*l. c.*, page 518), Fr. Schmidt says:

"Evolutionism has broken down all along the line. Leading ethnologists have now abandoned it and turn away from it, recognizing its untrustworthiness and insufficiency to supply a real basis for the solution of ethnologic problems. In most cases the departure is radical. If some authorities, as for instance, Fr. Krause, still cling to the theory with reference to certain problems, the adhesion is uncertain, and it is hoped that they, too, will soon find their way to light.

"It is now recognized that the proper method in ethnology which is a mental science, is the historical. This method is now being more fully applied, especially with reference to the migrations of nations and their cultures, and resulting points of contact and race-mixture.

The search after psychologic laws having the value of the laws of natural science must also be abandoned."

In a word, the power of evolutionary principles of culture has been definitely broken, and the happy results of freedom from this unscientific theory is now acknowledged by the foremost students of the science of man.

XI. Ethnology Supplies the Basis for Studies in the Development of Culture

Questions of origin are of the utmost importance in all discussions of the structure and the development of society and of the various forms of association and of social control. Hence ethnology, the science of the manners, customs, character, history and institutions of races, especially the so-called lower races, must furnish certain guiding principles to sociology. All schools of sociology will admit that the beginnings of social institutions are best seen among "primitives," and hence, the debt of sociology to ethnology.

Many of the writers of text-books of sociology, however, either seem to be unacquainted with the facts of modern ethnology, or, as Fr. Schmidt, S. V. D., has stated,[1] they seek data which that science cannot supply, while over-

[1] "Die Ethnologischen Grundlagen der Sociologie." Fünf Vorträge von der Limburger Generalversammlung; Köln, J. P. Bachem, 1908.

looking those important foundation principles which it offers and which are of great import in sociology.

As to the first accusation—seeking principles which ethnology cannot supply—we have a good example in the favorite dictum of some writers that among lower races there are no "leading individuals" but that the tribe presents a dull, homogeneous mass of minds. Now ethnology shows that this is false. Anyone who has read the biographical sketches of the distinguished Indian chiefs and leaders in the "Handbook of American Indians" will admit this. We mention only Big Jim (Shawnee), Black Hawk (Sauk and Fox), Keokuk, of the same tribe, Chief Joseph (Nez Percé), Red Cloud (Sioux), Kanakuk (Kickapoo Prophet), Osceola, (Seminole Leader), Ouray (Ute), Sequoya (Inventor of the Cherokee Alphabet), Tecumseh (Shawnee), etc. These men were not only noted for bravery on the warpath but were wise counsellors and orators.

Dr. Stephan states in his article, "Contributions to the Psychology of the Inhabitants of New Pomerania" (Bismarck Archipelago), [1]

[1] "Globus," 88 (1905), p. 209.

that he was "surprised to find in each one of these 'wild men' an individual of distinct character and accomplishment, in direct opposition to the opinion which regards a primitive people as a horde of entirely similar individuals, and which maintains that differences only come through education and culture." Again, the farther back we go in the history of tribal culture, the less do magical practices dominate. This is especially apparent when comparing the Pygmies (the lowest of African tribes) with those of a higher culture.

We have already pointed out what recent ethnologic research tells about the social and domestic life of the real "primitives," the Veddas, Bushmen, Negritos, Andaman Islanders. But these facts which can now be learnt so readily, are ignored by the text-book compilers. We need only add that in this lowest stage there is neither cannibalism nor human sacrifice. The Aztecs of Ancient Mexico, and several Oriental people who practiced the latter barbarity, stood relatively high in cultural development. In fact, Fr. Schmidt states that what we know about the real primitives and their concern for the old, the weak, the widows and the orphans,

does not lag in any way behind "our old age, widow and orphan insurance."

A careful study of the data of recent research among lower races will preserve future writers of text-books of sociology from falling into the errors and misconceptions that now mar a number of American manuals on the subject.

There seems to be, fortunately, a trend in American sociology towards this more objective and less individualistic presentation and study of social phenomena. At the meeting of the American Sociologic Society, in Chicago, on December 28, 1922, a speaker said that sociology must abandon a metaphysical approach to social problems and deal more with realities.

By all means, let sociology abandon the "metaphysical," that is falsely speculative and evolutionary attitude, of some text-book compilers, let it get away from preconceived theories and groundless suppositions, and "deal with realities." This is precisely what men like Wissler, Fr. Schmidt, Fr. Koppers, Dr. Lowie, all the leaders in anthropologic science cited above, in fact, all real students of the science of man, earnestly advocate. Sociology is the science of human group activities, and these

can be best studied in their concrete manifestations.

But is it not strange that those who loudly clamor for freedom from "metaphysical" constraint, very often build up airy hypotheses based on nothing better than "shop-worn preconceptions"? While scientists are cautious in describing conditions in ancient society, these writers seem able to reproduce accurately prehistoric backgrounds. Of course, the inevitable "may's," "we can readily imagine," "we may now perhaps assume," etc., play leading rôles in these reconstructions of primitive society. Among the listeners to the speaker at the Chicago meeting of the American Sociological Society there were several to whom the plea for paying attention to "realities" specially applied. For in their writings up to that day they had shown abundant evidence of having been carried away by preconceptions and misconceptions, and of having given way to the "high-piling hypothesis" mania.

The foregoing arguments have at least the merit of not being "metaphysical" in the odious sense attached to the term by the evolutionists. They are "objective." At least they show that

the followers of Morgan, Spencer, and J. G. Frazer, of Lubbock and Letourneau, no longer control the field of prehistory and of primitive custom and folklore. There is a swing of the pendulum from extreme evolutionary theories in explanation of cultural development, to a saner, as well as more rational and objective, study of the complex phenomena of human society. One evidence of this is the tendency to look to ethnology for the well-ascertained facts of primitive culture. And this tendency cannot but promise happy results for sociology—the science dealing with the principles and results of human association.

INDEX

African Primitives, 34.
Amazons, 55.
"Ancient Society," 13.
Andaman Islanders, 24, 92.
Anthropology, 71, 73, 75.
"Anthropologist, American," 18.
"Anthropos," 3, 7, 12.
Archaeology, In its relation to Ethnology, 1 ff.

Bachofen, 55, 62.
Bandelier, A. F., 82.
Bebel, 23, 31.
Bismarck Archipelago, 91.
Boas, 15, 87.
Bogoras, 20.
Bronze Age, 15.
Bushmen, 17, 42, 46, 92.

Chippewa, 49.
Chukchi, 20.
Communism, 18, 36.
Copper Age, 15.
Crow Indians, 51.
Culture, determinants of, 8.

Dieri, 19, 20.

Ellwood, 42.
Engels, 37.
Eskimo, 11, 45.
Ethnology, importance of, 1, 90; uncertain boundaries of, 1 ff.; definition of, 1.
Euahlayi, 29.
Evolution, social, 12; cultural, 14, 88.

Fewkes, J. W., 81.
Frazer, J. G., 3, 4, 5, 6, 13, 17.

Giddings, 75.
Gilyak, 19.
"Golden Bough," 3, 6, 7.
Goldenweiser, 84, 85, 86.
Gräbner, 12.
Group marriage, 20.

Hawaii, 20.
Hendle, O. S. B., 65.
Heredity, 10.
Hewitt, J. N. B., 32.
Historical School, 9.
Howitt, A. W., 27.
Hrdlička, Aleš, 81.

Indians, American, 16, 33.
Indian languages, 87.
Iroquois, 57.

Kautsky, 23.
Koppers, Dr. W., 12, 16, 28
Krause, Fr., 85.

Kroeber, A. L., 12, 81.
Kulturkreis-theorie, 12.

Lang, A., 83.
Language, 10.
Laufer, B., 12, 82.
Le Bon, Gustave, 35.
Le Roy, Bishop, 34, 82.
Letourneau, 95.
Levirate, 67.
Lowie, Robert, 7, 14, 15, 16, 19.
Lubbock, 12, 32.
Lummis, C. F., 82.

Maine, Sir H., 41.
Malinowski, 19, 25, 38, 64.
Man, E. H., 24, 27, 45.
Marx, 23.
Martin, R., 44.
Matriarchy, 54, 61.
Meyer, A. B., 29.
Mir, 43.
Missionaries, 2.
Mooney, Jas., 82.
Morgan, L. H., 7.
Morice, A. G., 82.

Negritos, 24, 92.
Nordenskiöld, 84, 87.

Oceania, 21.

Peschel, O., 60.
Philippine Islands, 29.
Polygamy, 18.
Polynesia, 21.
Private Property, 40; among Indians, 47, 48.
Pueblos, 61.
Pygmies, 42.

Rivers, H. W. R., 25.

Sapir, E., 85, 87.
Schleiter, Jr., 14.
Schmidt, S. V. D., 3, 82, 84, 88, 90, 92.
Seligmann, 29, 32.
Sexual Promiscuity, 17, 19.
Shoshone, 47.
Siberia, 19, 20, 30.
Skeat, W. W., 24.
Socialism, 37.
Sororate, 67.
Spencer H., 12, 13, 17, 59, 64.
Stone Age., 15.
Sumner, W. G., 30.
Swanton, J. R., 17.

Thomas, W. I., 16.
Tierra del Fuego, 22, 42.
Thompson River, 50.
Tungus, 15.
Tylor, E. B., 60

"Urfamilie," 31.

Veddas, 29, 32, 42, 46.

Wapogoro, 65.
Ward, Lester F., 62, 63.
Westermarck, E., 59, 64, 78.
Wissler, Clark, 9, 81.
Wundt, W., 26.

8691 575 M75
Muntsch, Albert
AUTHOR
Evolution and Culture
TITLE

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY